MINUTES LAKE COUNTY MT. PLYMOUTH-SORRENTO PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

February 8, 2006

The Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, February 8th, 2006 at 3:00 p.m. at the Sorrento Christian Center, 32441 CR 437N, Sorrento, Florida. The Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Planning Advisory Committee is an advisory committee for continued planning efforts within the Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento area as defined in Ordinance 2004-67.

Members Present:

G. Curtis Duffield, President Priscilla Bernardo Drugge, Vice-President Betty Ann Christian, Secretary

Tim Bailey Minnie Bollar Dr. Ronald Holman Scott Taylor Jeanne Etter Tommy Hight Judy Weis

Members Absent:

Tommy Hight, excused Sid Caruthers

Staff Present:

Terrie Diesbourg, Director, Lake County Customer Services Division
Joan Greaney, Public Hearing Coordinator-Lake County Comprehensive Planning
Quinette Durkin, Property Manager, Lake County Attorneys Office
Shannon Suffron, Senior Planner, Lake County Comprehensive Planning
Stacy Allen, Senior Planner, Planning & Development Division
Anita Greiner, Senior Planner, Planning & Zoning Division

Others Present:

Commissioner Catherine Hanson, Lake County Board of County Commissioners Laura Knutson, Program Coordinator, Central Florida Sustainable Communities Initiative (CFSCI)

Mark Reggentin, City of Mount Dora Planning Director Keith Schue, Local Planning Agency member

G. Curtis Duffield, President called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and noted that a quorum was present. He confirmed that Proof of Publication was on file in the Planning and Development Services Division and that the meeting had been noticed pursuant to the Sunshine Statute.

Mr. Curtis Duffield began the meeting by offering to the attendees some "Housekeeping Issues" so to speak; rather clarification on stating names, speaking clearer in making statements and when making motions. Generally to make it easier for minutes to be taken.

Betty Ann Christian noted that Joan Greaney did an excellent job on taking minutes. Curtis made that announcement and made a motion to pass the minutes for the January 11th, 2006 meeting. Motion was made and approved for these minutes with a three word correction requested by Ms. Priscilla Drugge on page three. This was done and minutes were posted.

Motion was made to remove Sid Caruthers' name from MPSAC list as he had not attended a meeting since last summer. Betty Ann made a motion to remove Sid's name as a member of the Committee and it was seconded by Scott Taylor, and approved by the Committee. Sid Caruthers name will be removed from the names of Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Advisory committee members.

Next motion presented by Curtis, was to change the time for the meetings.

Ms. Shannon Suffron suggested 3-5pm but Dr. Ronald Holman cannot arrive until 4 pm, so agreement was reached to begin with new starting time of 3:30 pm - 5:30 pm and no motions or important decisions would be made until after his arrival at 4 PM each meeting. This motion discussion was moved to later in the meeting.

Priscilla introduced her presentation, the Dark Skies and proceeded to hand out copies of the 14 page information packet. Priscilla mentioned that the first page defined light pollution and what it was. She mentioned the five (5) elements that make-up light pollution: Urban Sky Glow, Glare, Light Trespass, A Trashy Looking Nighttime Environment, and Energy waste. Full Cut-off light fixtures, use a shield on the light fixture, (this can be used on street lamps). It combats the up-glow and glare. Glare causes accidents, sort of hiding in the light, decreases security in some areas. People do not want to spend time in poor light areas. Wasted energy lighting up the sky; we want to stop it. Priscilla showed a picture of the wasted light particularly in the Orlando area and gives the example of Ordinance 02-1046 from the City of Casselberry, and how they handled such areas, such as light trespass.

Curtis asked Shannon if Dark Sky would need to be a separate issue. Shannon noted that they are in the proposed policies. Laura agreed.

Shannon moved next to the draft of Future Land Use Policies. She requested a consensus on these so they could be presented to the Local Planning Agency on Friday, February 24, 2006. Shannon requested a representative from MPSAC to be at that LPA meeting to make that presentation. Shannon introduced the issue of the Commercial location criteria, and not changing the language as it is. Right now one of the areas being proposed for the Town Center falls within the MPS Urban Compact Node and also the Wekiva Protection area. There is a maximum on commercial square footage up to 50,000 square feet within the Neighborhood Activity Center. If that language is not changed then it will severely

restrict what can be done with respect to the town center. The direction of the LPA is not to change that language; this is why we need to be at this LPA meeting to help guide them. Proposals and associated policies will be needed by the Local Planning Agency for them to discuss how they will deal with it.

Curtis asked if they need an aggregate number, is this where they are trying to get, or could they limit individual properties to a square foot with a total aggregate.

Shannon responded that one of the proposals to be but forth, once they give them the draft policies and some of the draft graphics, may help dictate what happens in that area, or direct them how to deal with that.

Jeanne stated there was language already on anchor size per footage. She asked that the Committee be able to discuss this.

Shannon stated we are going to leave that for them to discuss, as to how they will deal with it, after we give them what we discuss here today.

Keith said this is obviously a process that involves Comp Plan policies and then the LDR's to be written. "Is there a mechanism in place, once the Comp Plan is adopted, that those overlays here today, will remain in effect at least until the LDR's are done, so we do not have this vulnerable period of time?"

Shannon was not sure of the mechanism but suggested we bring it up at the Local Planning Agency meeting.

Shannon handed out copies of the Objective Future Land Use Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Historic Village and gave a lot of credit to Keith Schue and Laura Knutson for fine tuning the document, and added that they were almost there.

Discussion ensued on the name "Historic Village" and Shannon clarified the term and the framework for other areas.

Keith discussed the Historic Village, and said that within it you may have more than one FLU category. Policies that will all relate to protecting that area, a combination of zoning and land use that all get mapped into this overlay district.

Shannon spoke about mechanisms in the Comp Plan that will protect them from encroaching municipalities and future annexations in surrounding areas.

Shannon continued speaking about the Guiding Principles for Development and quoted from the copies of the draft of FLU objectives.

Tim Bailey requested discussion on integrating equestrian trails with the state park.

Shannon stated that in the integrated network, they could visit the equestrian language

February 8, 2006

within the Recreation Element; this would be an appropriate place to put it into the Comp Plan.

Next, Shannon introduced Zoning Overlay Districts and added that in last week's discussions, and in defining their box and what was outside of the box, the following overlay districts were mentioned and defined: the Village District, Suburban Residential District, Rural Transitional District and an Employment Center District. Shannon then requested that Keith define these districts.

Keith commented on the previous discussions, and he walked the committee through the well defined core area, the proposed Sorrento Villages Development, concentrated densities in the core area with single family residential development toward the South, and town homes toward the North. He spoke of an "envelope" where they would see higher densities in the mix-use area. Keith requested that they needed to clarify what to name this dotted box, instead of just, the Village District.

Several voices stated in unison that they liked the idea of the "Main Street District".

Laura asked if she should substitute "Main Street District" in this document wherever "Village District" is stated.

Keith counseled that there are some guiding principals of what a Main Street District would look like; he discussed examples of other cities such as Mt. Dora, Sanford and downtown Eustis. He mentioned examples of lighting, small shops, offices with living-spaces up above, traffic reduction or re-direction, pedestrian walkways, parking, and trees as he made reference to the bullets on the handout.

Jeanne noted that trees do not need to be defined and Tim added that they may wish to maximize the size of the canopy trees.

Jeanne added that she wanted the policy made clearer on anchor stores, to be more defined.

Laura asked if they did not want to pluralize anchor stores, maybe "anchor store" and she read that "an anchor store..." and continues to read from the sixth bullet listed on the handout under the Corridor District. Change was agreed upon. Laura noted that they had already voted that the Mt Plymouth Sorrento planning area would be the service area.

Several voices are heard on mix use and office spaces on top of grocery stores, and they requested clarification on foundation area. Laura suggested terminology on a foundation area, noting that the pad that is on the ground is used to figure out the square footage.

Conversation continued on the second-stories allowed on buildings and heights. It was suggested by Tim to give a reasonable height instead of the number of stories.

Shannon introduced the Suburban District.

February 8, 2006

Keith noted that there is interest out there to develop in this area and that 5.5 would not be appropriate to develop as you get further away from the core. It was expressed that they were looking at more of a density of two (2) units per acre.

Jeanne thought that two (2) units per acre was a fair number.

Shannon mentioned that the Sorrento Springs development on C.R. 437 fed into what they were looking at in the Suburban District.

Keith mentioned about the property rights issues and where they may have to allow for something higher if the Zoning is allowing for it. Keith continued to give direction, pointing to the map and explaining Transitional District.

Tim asked if Net Usable Acres were inclusive of open space, or wet lands or retention.

Keith responded that some retention could be included. He explained how they figure the net area, open space, roads and things like that. Conversation continued on open spaces, defining acres, and the minimum size of PUD's (Plan Unit Development).

Curtis stated that they had a consensus for 10 acres to be in the threshold for open space in the Rural and Suburban areas for development.

Keith brought up discussion on Open Space and to allow 50 percent open space for developers. He also brought up how clustering worked, citing two subdivisions on Wolf Branch Road which both have one unit per acre, but one is clustered to create open space.

Transportation presenters arrived from Public Works and the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Shannon suggested they let them speak and then the committee would have to return to the policy discussions.

Commissioner Catherine Hanson stated that they just needed to submit names to replace Sid Caruthers whose name they are removing from the Committee members list.

Curtis noted that we would discuss this at their next meeting.

T.J. Fish, Executive Director of MPO along with Tom Burke, a Planner with MPO and Fred Schneider, Director of Engineering with Public Works were introduced.

Shannon directed that they were to propose policy to these gentlemen, get their feed back and have them answer some questions.

Shannon introduced the first policy for review, the preservation of two-lane roads. Should they preserve land for future road usage?

Fred Schneider opened by stating, he saw no reason why something could not be supported as far as the type of streets that they wanted. He noted that they love to preserve right-of-ways, but there are legalities to deal with, as well as determinations on

February 8, 2006

how much right of way they can give away; it is tricky and much more difficult. Typically they have lost the legal battles. First step, develop the network that they would like to see. They will help with the long range visionary maps, and help the committee see those areas and where they are going.

Priscilla is interested in how to blend a grid pattern beyond that Village District Scenic Drive.

Fred stated that a grid system is usually half a mile; a quarter mile might be too much for what they are doing. They have to go with what is developed, what is undeveloped, minus out all the water and how many homes, units, commercial and then figure how many trips on the roads. Residential Roads are not required to inter-connect but cautioned to be careful not to have an internal system of roads that makes it difficult to get from point A to point B.

T.J. Fish said he and Tom looked at the traffic, how it would increase as properties developed. If they wanted to establish S.R.46 as a Main Street concept, keep it a two-lane road, and follow the concept of disbursing traffic, and creating a system where they do not drastically increase densities, (which would require utilities), two lanes would support this, as long as they connected everything.

Curtis and Shannon clarified interconnection and noted the page on the Transportation Network on the handout.

Fred directed that you do not want open swales in the urban core, told them to define what type of roads they wanted, make decisions on that and give his staff direction. Discussion continued on where to put the swales, sidewalks, lower speeds, and the usage of trees in landscaping.

T.J. Fish added that they should be specific in their priorities, specify the vision they wanted. Noting that curbing slowed cars down and if this was what they wanted, then they needed to be more specific.

Jeanne asked was it feasible to say that when giving roads back to the County, referencing S.R. 46, you could have the businesses with parking on them which paralleled or slanted, and reduce the speed limit.

Fred stated that if you change the characteristic of the road you can control speed. Discussion and questions were voiced about how to do this.

Quinette Durkin, Lake County Attorney Office, noted that it was a long process in determining who owns the railroad and the County is going to make an offer to purchase the abandoned railroad throughout the County. It will be a long process especially dealing with individual owners.

Laura asked if S.R. 46 could come back to local ownership.

Fred stated that would be hard to determine; it would have to be part of the over all picture and depend on what could be worked out between the County and the Department of Transportation. There was no time frame but part of a big picture with the expressway on all of that.

Keith added that timing was very critical and he voiced concern on what that timing would be.

T.J. Fish stated that Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Main Street was going to be a DOT jurisdictional road, a good chunk of the window of this planning effort. There were still studies going on, nothing had been decided yet. They still have a huge question mark about the timing. DOT has to respect policies in the Comp Plan.

Shannon added that DOT will still own S.R. 46 and T.J. Fish stated that it will probably be another decade before they see changes.

Next realigning of 437 was introduced by Laura.

Fred added this will be a five (5) year study; looking at social impacts, environmental impacts, where will the corridor be. Defining how much right of way will they will get.

Betty Ann Christian asked, "What are we going to do with all that traffic?"

Keith reaffirmed that there was discussion to keep S.R. 46 a two-lane road.

- T.J. Fish stated that they need to define what they wanted, is the Community behind it, are they willing to fund it, to create policies and find ways to generate funds. The County only has impact fee funds from the new impact; funding will always be an issue.
- T.J. Fish noted that the good news is they have the Wekiva River Protection Area to their East. But over time there is going to be a traffic overload, there will have to be something eventually done. Potentially Round Lake Road, but S.R. 441 will continue to fail unless they get a better corridor that goes from this parkway, whenever it is built in the next decade, all the way around Lake County.

Discussion on traffic and overloads of highways continued with everyone voicing concerns.

Scott asked about the time frames in reference to S.R. 46, direct us, are we looking at the feasibility in the next ten years.

T.J. Fish stated that they cannot four-lane S.R.46 through Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento because it is not in the Comprehensive Plan or in the Long Range Plan for the MPO. That is not going to happen, as long as this remains the case.

Laura, questioned, "As far as making this a walk able Village Center, while it is still

February 8, 2006

owned by the State, we cannot do much to the roadway, as far as adding sidewalks or parking, we can't really do that?"

T.J....that's a tricky question, we can do stuff.

Tim, "It would appear to me as though people in the 'purple area' are going to be hugely rewarded financially for having property in there, if that is a given. Should they not pay a tax for having been rewarded, and that tax could apply towards things such as widening and decorating the landscaping of the road."

T.J. responded, "If your vision involves public construction infrastructure, and we know that it is a long way before we see any funds available, that is the only way you are going to spark this to have the incentive, that is to look to generate funds some how. Whether it is through a special district, through assessment...."

Discussion on funding continued and working with DOT regarding traffic management.

Jeanne asked if they should specify this for any new development in that area, that the developer has to provide the road system.

Priscilla, "That is something the community and the charettes have said that they do not want to be taxed."

Shannon said they would discuss these items at a later meeting, hold a roadway visioning session, and she encouraged the committee move on so they could finish what they needed to cover.

T.J. suggested as a strong recommendation that they tell how they wanted the road network to work, where they wanted their swales, where they thought sidewalks were needed, and directed that they could go from there and start planning it.

Shannon asked if the public had any questions for the Transportation Staff.

Leslie Garvis, a resident does not want all the traffic on Wolf Branch Road, which is already there, just because it is easier and faster than S.R. 46.

TJ stated it will get worse before it gets better. The plan that we are doing for the overall network, still allows an opportunity for S.R. 46 to remain two lane, or more rural in character. You do have some cut-through that would like to go East and West rather than go S.R. 46 to Mt. Dora. The overall network, especially the new section of S.R. 46, from Orange County to Mt. Dora is going to help tremendously. He asked Mark Reggentin, Director Planning of the City of Mt. Dora, if Mt. Dora had a specific policy on Wolf Branch Road as a corridor of any kind.

Mark replied, "Just to maintain a scenic corridor."

Keith mentioned that Mt. Dora had some language in there recognizing Wolf Branch

February 8, 2006

Road as a scenic corridor and I think Commissioner Hanson had said it a number of times. Have some type of policy constrained status on Wolf Branch road. So when you have roads with some type of particular character, this sets the stage for what should and should not happen.

T.J. suggested to the Committee to adopt that policy and for the Committee to decide if there are too many cars for the way this road is built, then policy is the way they would want to help control it. He said that this was acceptable.

Keith directed a question to Mark, is it policy constrained and Mark responded, "Not policy constrained, but physically constrained".

Keith noted that Markham Woods Road in Seminole County had a lot of traffic, but he could not imagine what it would have been like if they had not had policy constrained.

Shannon stated that they needed to continue with public questions.

Anthony Grigg, stated to have something about S.R. 46 added to policy would be alright; for it to remain a two-lane road as long as utilities did not come in.

T.J agreed and added that unless they chose as a community to drastically increase their densities, and that they cannot do that unless they make a huge commitment toward utilities, toward water and sewer. When they were ready to build apartment buildings and things like that, but it did not seem to be the way they were going, maybe 50 years from now, the people of Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento would talk about that, but it seems right now they want to be a village.

T.J. added that if they chose to change or increase their densities, this would change what they all do, it would change the computer models, and they would have to deal with a whole lot more traffic. Their communities network will function just fine now with two-lane roads, when the Wekiva Parkway is finished.

Judy stated that she thought development could not go on unless utilities were brought in. Shannon responded that there were on-going discussions about utilities, but that there was nothing concrete yet, no agreement yet it was just in the discussion stage.

Jackie Witt asked, "Where has it been determined about the Western connection?"

T.J. said it had not been determined. They have 5 or 10 possible alignments, they want to cut this down and they have been listening to input to refine the plans. The conceptual process is still going on.

Fred told her that she could go on to the Orlando Orange County Expressway Authority Website and that it will direct her as to what is going on with the expressway.

Charlie Sterein resident, "There is a 460 acre parcel agreement between Adair and S.R.46, does that property have access on Adair"?

February 8, 2006

T.J. responded to Mr. Stevens, telling him that legally, if the property touches Adair, they have the option of asking for access now through the County and State permitting process for driveway connections to be established there, but it is somewhat of a control issue. So if it made more sense for the access to be only to S.R. 46, and not put traffic onto Adair, that was a possibility.

Charlie said that goes against what he was hearing, on inner-connecting subdivisions.

Fred, "If you are forcing them onto S.R. 46 because you are afraid to put increase traffic onto Adair, then where did the connectivity issue just go. That was something we have to balance, disbursing traffic so it doesn't load up onto S.R. 46".

Shannon asked if there were any further questions specifically for Transportation. Then she directed them to proceed with the meeting. Shannon thanked the three transportation gentlemen for coming and they left the meeting, at which point Shannon brought the committee's attention back to policy issues.

Shannon introduced the Gateway/Landmark and explained that this was all good and stated they would incorporate the Main Street issue.

Next, Environmental Design Standards, and Shannon read what the language would be and further stated that all the concerns were encompassed.

Keith added that he felt that it does encompass the variety of things which the Wekiva Study Area spoke of. He added that water usage was a huge concern, and he wanted measures to reduce water consumption, and directed that more detail would be covered in the Comprehensive Plan.

Jeanne referenced her concerns on the issue of the use of re-claimed water for irrigation as that it implied that they have utilities. Is there a best management practice on irrigation? She did not want to promote the idea that they were going to put in sewers so they could have reclaimed water. She suggested they add "where available," Shannon agreed that this could be added.

Next option, Shannon introduced the Preservation of Tree Canopy and read that it was pretty straight forward.

Shannon then moving on to the protection of the Dark Skies; and that they would be looking at the City of Casselberry Ordinance 02-1046. They are going to adopt the exterior lighting ordinance for the MPS Planning Area, preserve Dark Skies. They would fine tune this when they get to that point.

Moving on to Signage and Advertisement, Shannon heard requests to address the size and location of the signs. She told them they would get into the details of how this will all pan out when they got into the details of the Land Development Regulations.

The Transportation Network, they covered with the Transportation folks and they have

notes on suggestions that they have made, and they will be incorporated into it.

Priscilla asked that we remember the Equestrian Trails.

The next policy, in dealing with Parking, Shannon read from the handout and stated that an agreement will be made on the name of Main Street in the Village District at this meeting.

Jeanne asked if they would define fifty spaces in the LDR.

Keith asked for clarification on the shared parking. He had requested that we not have parking lots on Main Street. Shannon responded that they could get together on that.

Tim was not happy with fifty (50) parking spaces in front on Main Street, he was concerned with that. Laura noted that LDR's would define this, she added that this was an over site on her part on how the language got combined, they would eliminate the fifty number. This is suppose to be behind and out of view of the main street; everything with the exception of the on-street parking.

Jeanne added that it does state that it would allow 50 parking spaces, we do not want that. The pods have got to be less in number.

Keith discussed the pods and that they are not on the road. What he was visualizing was similar to downtown Mt. Dora.

Mark said they called them parking lots; twenty to forty spaces.

They all agreed upon twenty spaces.

Shannon moved on to Traffic Calming and read from the document handout.

Laura explained the term "bulb-out" as the areas, such as those which have speed pillows, or speed humps which slow the traffic in a down town area.

Shannon next introduced Policy FLU Mt. Plymouth-Sorrento Finance District.

Laura clarified that if they chose to create a tax increment finance district, it would freeze the assessed value of a certain area, so that over the next 26 years, the increase over that base year goes back into the community. Taxes are not any different than they would be. So it goes to the Community and not back to the County and you can use these to fund all the ideas that they have.

Shannon and Laura are meeting with people to get further clarification about these tools and how they would apply to this particular area. They will come back to the committee at a later meeting and present those findings. They are looking into the options to present to the committee so that they can make this funding happen.

February 8, 2006

Laura introduced part two, the Affordable Housing section. Laura wanted to make certain that there was some language in there for this. She noted that the County stated that you could use a non-profit housing corporation, and Laura knew of one she could recommend.

Priscilla asked if they could separate those two and not combine them.

Jeanne stated that she is not willing to put more money into a separate fund. It sounds good on paper and she feels that the County could increase taxes.

Tim noted that taxes are not new.

Curtis said it is just a redirection of your taxes.

Laura stated that the level that you are paying to Tavares will keep going to Tavares; any increase in your property value would come back and go into your own fund.

Shannon directed that they would revisit this, adding that the policy is all a draft at this point and they would have to go over it again. She encouraged everyone who could to attend the Local Planning Agency meeting on Friday, February 24th 2006 at 9 am, held in Room 233 of the Administration Building of Lake County.

Priscilla suggested that they take a slower route in implementing a finance mechanism, and she added that they do not necessarily need to go fast, and asked that Shannon and Laura just remove the last sentence under "Finance".

Shannon added possibly, that the committee would explore a variety of financing mechanisms and have a policy stating that they would look into those mechanisms, while promising that they will revisit this objective after she and Laura completed their meeting with the finance representatives. They would remove the last objective on finance at that time.

Curtis introduced the motion to change the meeting times from: 4pm – 6 pm to 3:30 pm–5:30 pm., adding that there would no longer be a need for three hour meetings. The motion to change meeting time from 4pm – 6pm to the new time of 3:30 pm-5:30 pm was made, seconded and approved. Next meeting, Wednesday, February 22nd will begin at 3:30 pm.

Tim made the motion to change the meeting times and it was seconded, and unanimously approved for all future meetings. It was noted that the new time, as well as two hour meetings from 3:30 pm–5:30 pm., would begin with the meeting on Wednesday, February 22^{nd} 2006.

Curtis requested a motion to adjourn, it was seconded and the meeting ended at 6 PM.

The chair adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.	
Joan M. Greaney	Betty Ann Christian
Public Hearing Coordinator	Secretary